UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,875	09/18/2006	**Tak Wing Lam**	PA030018	9565

24498 7590 02/01/2011

Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER	
QUADER, FAZLUL	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/01/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/566,875	LAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	FAZLUL QUADER	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 December 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-9 are pending in this application.

2. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment on 12/08/2010.

3. Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-9 have been amended on 12/08/2010.

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/08/2010, with respect to claims 1-9 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response see discussion below.

Specification

5. In view of the amended specification dated 12/08/2010, the objections are being withdrawn.

Objection to Claims

6. In view of the amendments to the claims submitted on 12/08/2010, the earlier objections are being withdrawn.

The claim 1, however, is objected to for a grammatical error in line 6, where the claim recites "**an** removable optical disk".

However, "the removable optical disk" would be more appropriate.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

7. In view of the amendments to the Claims 1-9, the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, are being withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-9 of the application (effective filing date: Feb. 02, 2006) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tripp et al. (US 6516337; date of patent: Feb. 04, 2003), hereinafter "Tripp", in view of Mourad et al. (US 20030135464; pub. date: Jul. 17, 2003), hereinafter "Mourad" and further

in view of Wright et al. (US 20050055578; filed: Jul. 21, 2004) hereinafter "Wright".

10. As to claim 1, Tripp discloses, a method implemented in an apparatus form reading from removable optical disk, the file system indicating the physical position of the content on the removable optical disk (col. 5, lines 9-29), including the steps of:

Upon insertion of an removable optical disk into the apparatus, determining a signature of the removable optical disk by measuring features based on a data pattern stored on the removable optical disk, the signature including a plurality of elements (col. 5, line 66 to col. 6, line 17, digital signature or meta files are stored);

retrieving the associated file system indicating the physical position of the content on the removable optical disk from the content database (col. 5, lines 14-18, each object reference is a pointer which specified a location; col. 7, lines 42-52).

Tripp, however, does not explicitly disclose comparing the signature with a plurality of signatures stored in a content database; and

Wright, however, discloses comparing the signature with a plurality of signatures stored in a content database (Wright: [0167]).

Wright and Tripp are of the same field of endeavor, they specifically teach digital signature as method of identifying document (Tripp: col. 7, lines 42-52; Wright: [0013]).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Wright into Tripp of content sending to a central indexing meta data or signatures from objects on a computer network that would have allowed users of Tripp to determine whether the message has not been altered during distribution by comparing the signature with a plurality of signatures stored in a content database (Wright: [0167]).

Tripp also does not explicitly disclose, "the signature is equal to a signature stored in the content database".

Mourad, on the other hand, discloses, "the signature is equal to a signature stored in the content database" ([0218], lines 1-14);

Wright, Tripp and Mourad are of the same field of endeavor, they specifically teach digital signature as method of identifying document (Tripp: col. 7, lines 42-52; Mourad: ([0218], lines 1-14; Wright: [0013]).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Mourad into Tripp as modified by Wright that would have allowed users of Tripp to determine whether the message has not been altered during distribution (Mourad: [0218], lines 12-14).

11. As to claim 2, Tripp as modified discloses, method according to claim 1, wherein the step of comparing the signature with a plurality of signatures stored in a content database includes evaluating the distances between the determined signature and the signatures stored in the content database (Tripp: col. 7, lines 28-35).

12. As to claim 3, Tripp as modified discloses, method according to claim 1, wherein the steps of determining the signature of the removable optical disk and comparing the signature with a plurality of signatures include: determining a first part of the signature including a plurality of elements (Tripp: col. 6, lines 3-12); comparing the first part of the signature with corresponding parts of the plurality of signatures stored in the content database (Tripp: col. 7, lines 28-35); determining a further part of the signature if the first part of the signature is equal

to the corresponding part of at least one signature stored in the content database (Tripp: col. 7, lines ; and comparing the further part of the signature with corresponding parts of the plurality of signatures stored in the content database (Tripp: col. 7, lines 35-52; col. 51, lines 49-52).

13. As to claim 4, Tripp as modified discloses, method according to claim 1, wherein, in the comparing steps, a negative progressive search approach is employed, in which the elements of the determined signature are compared with the corresponding elements of the signatures stored in the content database one at a time (Tripp: col. 7, lines 28-35), wherein a negative search result is concluded if there is no match between one element of the signature and the same element of all the signatures stored in the content database (Tripp: col. 7, lines 28-35; col. 7, lines 56-62).

14. As to claim 5, Tripp as modified discloses, method according to claim 1, further including the steps of: obtaining the file system from the removable optical disk if the determined signature is not equal to a signature stored in the content database (Tripp: col. 7, lines 28-35); and storing the obtained file system and the determined signature in the content database (Tripp: col. 7, lines 28-35; col. 1, lines 57-60).

15. As to claim 6, Tripp as modified discloses, method according to claim 1, wherein the signature is unique for every removable optical disk (Tripp: col. 54,

lines 23-25).

16. As to claim 7, Tripp as modified discloses, method according to claim 1, wherein the signature elements are selected from the disk status such as open or closed disk, number of sessions or number of tracks in each session, from timing information such as the lead-in time of each session, the lead-out time of each session, the total time of each session or subcode information of each track, or from data integrity such as data checksums of specific tracks (Tripp: col. 1, lines 57-60; col. 6, lines 53 to col. 7, line 2)

17. As to claim 8, the claim can be rejected for the same reason as claim 1. In addition, Tripp as modified discloses, a removable apparatus for reading from and/or writing to an optical disk wherein the apparatus includes at least one element adapted for retrieving a file system of the optical disk, the file system indicating the physical position of the content on the optical disk (Tripp: col. 5, lines 9-29)),

Mourad discloses, determining a signature of the optical disk by measuring features based on a data pattern stored on the optical disk, the signature including a plurality of elements; comparing the signature with a plurality of signatures stored in a content database; and Retrieving the associated file system indicating the physical position of the content on the optical disk from the content database if the signature is equal to a signature

stored in the content database (col. 5, lines 14-18, each object reference is a pointer which specified a location; col. 7, lines 42-52; [0218], lines 1-14);

Wright discloses comparing the signature with a plurality of signatures stored in a content database (Wright: [0167]).

Mourad discloses, "the signature is equal to a signature stored in the content database" ([0218], lines 1-14);

18. As to claim 9, the claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 1. In addition, Mourad discloses the contents can be played back and playback quality can be checked. (Mourad: [0270], lines 1-8).

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed 12/08/2010, with respect to claims 1-9 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response see discussion below.

In view of the amended specification dated 12/08/2010, the objections are being withdrawn.

In view of the amendments to the claims submitted on 12/08/2010, the earlier objections to the claims are being withdrawn.

In view of the amendments to the Claims 1-9, the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, are being withdrawn.

As for claim rejections under USC 103, the applicant argues that Tripp's method is not implemented in an apparatus for reading from removable optical disks. Furthermore, Tripp's method is not performed upon insertion of an optical disk into the apparatus. Tripp does not mention or even suggest optical disks or other types of optical media.

Examiner responds by mentioning that Tripp discloses local storage media that includes all types (col. 13, lines 61-62), Wright discloses removable client devices and reconnecting them in paragraph [0128]. Mourad in paragraph [0625] discloses removable storage including removable disk.

The applicant further argues that Tripp does not appear to be concerned about the physical position of the files on the recording medium - this task is the responsibility of the operating system to match the logical position to the physical position.

The examiner responds by saying that Tripp discloses retrieving the associated file system indicating the physical position of the content on the removable optical disk from the content database (col. 5, lines 14-18, each object reference is a pointer which specifies a location; col. 7, lines 42-52).

In addition, Mourad discloses the scenario where "the signature is equal to a signature stored in the content database" ([0218], lines 1-14);

As for the response for the dependent claims, please see the respective dependent claims for the response.

Contact Information

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FAZLUL QUADER whose telephone number is (571)270-1905. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5 Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/FAZLUL QUADER/
Examiner, Art Unit 2164